UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,593	04/02/2007	Yu-Ro Lee	1403-09 PCT US	9844
	7590 02/18/201 L LAW FIRM, LLP	EXAMINER		
290 Broadhollo		NGUYEN, LEON VIET Q		
Suite 210E Melville, NY 11747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
·			2611	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/18/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/583,593	LEE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	LEON-VIET Q. NGUYEN	2611	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 04 February 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, www. with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth interthan SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the siset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount on the nortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the second co	sideration and/or search (see NOT v); er form for appeal by materially rec	E below); lucing or simplifying tl	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed an example of the complex of the	·		•
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 20-23. Claim(s) objected to: 5,6,8 and 9. Claim(s) rejected: 1-3,7,10-13 and 15-19. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. \square The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.
 REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but see continuation sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/David C. Payne/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2611			

Regarding claim 1, applicant asserts that Hadad does not disclose the RS code being allocated to a corresponding base station based on a number of the subcarrier groups, a basic RS code, a group number, and a cell number (Remarks page 10 fourth paragraph). Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Hdaded teaches a subcarrier allocation method using RS codes, with different base stations having different RS codes (¶0108). The subcarrier allocation method comprises dividing subcarriers into carrier groups (¶0091), assigning group numbers to each user (¶0093-¶0095), receiving an RS code pertaining to the groups (¶0097), and assigning each user a different code (¶0060), which is interpreted to be a cell number.

Also regarding claim 1, applicant asserts that Simmonds does not disclose partitioning subcarrier groups and symbols from the uplink channels based on a basic pilot patter generated by a specific reference (Remarks page 11 fourth paragraph).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Simmonds teaches allocating subcarriers as pilot channels (col. 4 lines 46-48). The pilot channels are interpreted to be groups. The group allocation is based on pilot allocation information (col. 4 lines 47-49), where the pilot allocation information is determined using channel characteristics (col. 4 lines 37-40). The pilot allocation information is interpreted to be a basic pilot pattern and the channel characteristics are interpreted to be specific references.

Further regarding claim 1, applicant asserts that neither Hadad or Simmonds teaches differently allocating the pilot per subcarrier group based on the basic pilot pattern from the hopped data (Remarks page 12 first paragraph).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Hadad teaches allocating different codes corresponding to each of the groups for different base stations (¶0112). It would be obvious that each group of subcarriers include a pilot sequence from the hopped data (¶0032). It is well known in the art that OFDM communications (¶0077) utilize a pilot or preamble sequence.